UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Pearl S. Buck on Birth Control

From Our Washington Correspondent

Though the Heavens Fall (*An Editorial*) - - - - *Joseph Ernest McAfee*

How Fares the League of Nations? *Ellen Hörup*

An Observer in Japan - - *Dorothy Walton*

Geography and World Peace - *Ralph Westlake*

National Law Against Lynching - - - - - - *William Pickens*

Fathers Are Not Liars - *Frank S. Harwood*

VOLUME CXV NUMBER 1

Chicago, March 4, 1935

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Bi-Weekly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter November 15, 1933, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 3
Though the Heavens Fall—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 5
Jottings.—J. H. H. 6

ARTICLES—
Selected—*Walter Duranty* 3
From Our Washington Correspondent 7
How Fares the League of Nations?—ELLEN HÖRUP 8
An Observer in Japan—DOROTHY WALTON 9
Geography and World Peace—RALPH WESTLAKE 11
National Law Against Lynching—WILLIAM PICKENS 13
Fathers Are Not Liars—FRANK S. HARWOOD 14

POETRY—
Beyond Redemption—ANNERIKA FRIES 17

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Logic of Love—CLIFFORD HAZELDINE OSBORNE 16
A Stirring Autobiography—JAMES A. FAIRLEY 16
Bluff King Hal—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 17

CORRESPONDENCE—
Protagonist of Civil Liberties—WINIFRED B. COSSETTE 18
Joseph Dana Miller Convincing—EMILY E. F. SKEEL 18

THE FIELD—
Why the Nazis Dismissed Barth—*Henry Smith Leiper* 2
Blind—(A Poem)—ANTON ROMATKA 20
The Treaty of Versailles—(A Poem)—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 20

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Why the Nazis Dismissed Barth

By Henry Smith Leiper

A decision of a Nazi disciplinary civil court sitting in Cologne on December 20 expels from his professorship at the University of Bonn the most noted living Protestant theologian, Dr. Karl Barth. No action which the Nazi government has taken has more vividly revealed the sinister Caesarism of which it is the chief representative today. By the testimony of the presiding judge, Walter Scheerbarth, the theologian's original refusal to swear an unequivocal oath to Chancellor Hitler was not the chief reason for his dismissal. He had declared his willingness to reconsider the oath on the basis of an interpretation issued by the Brotherhood Council of the Confessional Church, which declared that every Christian in swearing by the name of God explicitly limits his obedience to acts which he can justify as a Christian.

According to the correspondent of the *New York Times,* the court was shocked when Dr. Rust, acting as prosecuting attorney, informed them that the interpretation of the oath by the Confessional Church is inadmissible because German citizens are expected to recognize that in taking an oath to obey Adolf Hitler they do so regardless of any and all religious scruples, principles, or teachings. This, of course, is the logical Nazi neo-pagan viewpoint, and agrees exactly with the prosecutor's contention that theological as well as other faculties are simply state institutions entirely subject to the will of the Minister of Culture in all matters regarding their work. Since consideration of the oath was disregarded, the whole weight of the trial rested upon the two other charges brought by Dr. Bernhard Rust, Reich Minister of Culture. The first of these was that Professor Barth had omitted to use the Hitler salute before and after his class, and the second was that in a conversation in Berlin last year he had asserted there could be a difference of opinion between equally good Christians on matters such as concentration

(*Continued on page* 18)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXV MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1935 Number 1

It is one of the paradoxes of the present situation in Europe that, although the danger of war is universally recognized, there is a growing opinion that war is not a satisfactory or even permanent settlement of disputes among nations.

* * * *

Twenty years ago the great powers of Europe, with the possible exception of Russia, believed that the risk of war was confined to the alternative between victory and defeat. Today they know that there exists the greater danger of revolution, which may involve winners and losers alike in common ruin.

—*Walter Duranty* in "Europe: War or Peace."

Are men never to escape from lesser loyalties of group and clan to the one highest loyalty of mankind? All through the Middle Ages, loyalty to the church was the supreme evidence of human devotion. This was celebrated, at critical times by excommunications, inquisition, and *auto-da-fés*. In the Renaissance and Reformation period man escaped from this bondage of superstition, only to fall into the snare of nationalism—a new loyalty, to the nation instead of to the church, as pestilential as any barbarism of savage tribes. Think of how we celebrate this loyalty—with concentration camps, and "purges," and "the purple testament of war"! But at last it has seemed as though we were going to throw off this mania. Since the World War, the conscientious objector has become a momentous figure, heralding a movement to subordinate loyalty to governments without to the higher loyalty of conscience within. Surely, the final fellowship of peace, the world-wide brotherhood of man, is well in sight! But just at this happy moment there comes a third partial and parochial loyalty to bedevil the human race. We refer, of course, to class loyalty—devotion to the one social group of the proletariat in the class war that is looming in the future. That we sympathize with the proletariat, we trust we need not emphasize in this place. That we believe the class struggle is here, whether we like it or not, we need not specify at this time. But what appalls us is the fact that this class consciousness is only one more instance of that fatal separation—religious, political, and now social or economic—which has been the curse of mankind for the last score or more of centuries. Tragic is the spectacle these days of the fine idealistic young men who are all through with the silly and tragic business of international war, and yet are hot for the equally silly and tragic business of class war. There is no salvation anywhere in a partial, divisive loyalty. Mankind is going to be saved all together, or not at all. Our loyalty, whatever the consequences, must be a single loyalty to all the human race.

It is a relief on occasion to turn aside from detailed questions of policy and program, and consider great principles of action. There is one such principle which we believe should be emphasized, and justly placed to the credit of Mr. Roosevelt and his administration. Out of the wreckage of the NRA the dangerous orgy of spending and thus piling up the national debt, and the superb but timid gesture of the social insurance plan, there emerges at least one good, and this a momentous good. We refer to the acceptance of the principle, now never to be lost, that the government is ethically and legally responsible for the economic security of its citizens. If the President has done nothing else, he has at least done this one thing to make his day forever memorable, and that is to assume as a rightful obligation the protection of the life, health, and happiness of every humblest individual in the land. Hitherto, this business of food and shelter has been left aimlessly and indifferently to charity. When business washed its hands of all responsibility for employment and unemployment, private almoners had to take hold and carry the burden. In serious cases, or in times of crisis, local authorities in town and city were called in. But now, under Mr. Roosevelt's leadership, this whole matter has been taken over by the nation. For the first time in the history of America, the welfare of the individual citizen has been made a first charge upon government. This marks a change so complete, that it may well be regarded as marking a turning-point in our history. A new era is opening, more important than the era which followed upon the freeing of the chattel slaves. For first steps must lead to later steps, which must in the end transform our whole society. This recognition of government responsibility for poverty led first, of course, to an unprecedented program of direct relief. This was followed by a program of public works, and this in turn by initial insurance plans. Before long the government, which is thus dealing with consequences of social misery, must deal with causes and thus take over vast areas of industry. Yes, the revolution has started!

Will the vast debt of the United States, now mounting to colossal proportions, be paid in due course? It will *not!* Anybody investing today in government securities with the idea that they will ever be redeemed is as foolish as anybody who invested yesterday in German bonds. This is not because the country is not able to meet even such stupendous financial obligations as the President is now lightheartedly laying upon us. Thirty, forty, fifty billions of dollars —yes, such a debt could be paid off if only we worked hard enough! But there's the rub! Who is "we," and what chance is there of this "we" being willing to bind themselves to the slavery of interminable debt payments? What we have here, to our way of thinking, is a situation exactly analogous to that presented not so long ago by German reparations. These monstrous obligations could have been paid by a nation of over 60,000,000 Germans turned into serfs for a period of two or three generations. But the Germans were not willing to be turned into serfs! Especially the new generation, which had nothing to do with the war which incurred the reparations, speedily made up its mind to ignore and defy this debt. If the reparations must be paid, let the fathers, who were responsible for the war, discharge the bill for the same! So the sons and daughters of the war generation refused to give attention to what was no affair of theirs—and the reparations collapsed of their own weight. So with the Roosevelt debt! The President, with his accustomed nonchalance, is piling up this prodigious pinnacle—for posterity to carry! He dare not lay the burden on us today, for we are voters, and might turn and rend the man responsible for such a burden. So he says—we'll pass it on to babes unborn to pay! Will they pay it? *Never!* A government bond looks nice, but it isn't really worth a plugged nickel. If you don't believe it, wait and see!

A thick-and-thin champion of Soviet Russia, attempting to defend the Stalin massacre of 117 men and women without trial as a result of the assassination of Kirov, puts the case as follows:

> The Soviet government chose the method it adopted in regard to the 117 enemies of the Soviet masses as the most effective method that the situation at the moment required so as to effectively safeguard the interests of the 170,000,000 in the U. S. S. R.

A defense as flexible as this should have wider application. Surely, this is a rule of procedure which should be adopted elsewhere than in Russia. Perhaps it has already been so adopted! We seem to have heard something like it. Thus:

> The Nazi government chose the method it adopted in regard to the Jewish enemies of the German masses as the most effective method that the situation required so as to effectively safeguard the interests of the 65,000,000 of nordics in the Reich.

Or thus:

> The Southern mob chose the method it adopted in regard to the Negro who was lynched as the most effective method that the situation required so as to effectively safeguard the interests of the 5,000,000 white women of the South.

And perhaps thus, tomorrow:

> The Roosevelt administration chose the method adopted in regard to arresting and imprisoning all Communists in the country as the most effective method that the situation required so as to effectively safeguard the interests of the 120,000,000 in the U. S. A.

Readers of UNITY need not be told at this late date that we are the friend of the Soviet Republic. It is just for this reason that we cry out against the Stalin slaughter of the 117 as the kind of thing most certain to weaken and in the end destroy the greatest and most beneficent experiment in social progress that modern times have known. The slaughter in question has heartened every enemy as it has shocked every friend of the Soviet. Is Russia going to go the way of Germany, and alienate the very sympathy and support which she was at last winning to her cause?

Why should anybody be deceived by this Anglo-French pact for peace (so-called)? Why should our foreign correspondents be telling us that this agreement between Britain and France, approved by Italy and proffered to Germany, will ease the whole international situation, and push the menace of war beyond the frontiers of this generation? Have we learned nothing during the last quarter of a century that we should be thus deluded by this agreement among bandits to help each other if either or all of them get into trouble? Are we to believe, after all we have seen and heard and suffered, that agreements of any kind mean anything while nations go right ahead arming themselves to the teeth and pursuing unremittingly their imperialistic designs upon mankind? As though to teach the hollowness of the whole business, Italy has come along at just the right moment to show us what is going on and how ridiculous, therefore, is all this talk of peace and mutual aid. Certainly, the Ethopia affair is an eye-opener for those whose eyes close in placid slumber the moment a king waves an olive branch or a premier feeds a dove! Typical of everything that went on during the nineteenth century and led eventually to the Great War is this wanton assault by Mussolini upon an independent but weak nation which chances to stand in the way of his ruthless exploitation of Africa. Other powers—France, for example—do not interfere, since they are glad to put Italy under obligation not to interfere in *their* case when *they* want to put over a dirty piece of work. As for the League of Nations—alas, it reveals again its impotence, though Abyssinia is a League member and thus entitled to equal rights and privileges with all other nations of the earth. But, as so many times before, the League does nothing when a great power is involved. That at such a time, and under such circumstances, Chancellor Hitler should look askance at

anything presented by his European rivals is surely the best service he can render Germany, and probably the world. At any rate it is our hope that the Reich will repudiate the Anglo-French plot, and thus clear the air of sham if nothing more.

We would like to see the churches as active in other social matters as they are on certain issues traditionally associated with religious idealism. In the liquor fight, for example, they have never failed. Perhaps it is because "booze" so directly and terribly affects the individual, and his home and family, that the churches have been militant and frequently triumphant in their opposition; but, in any case, they have led the van. So also with indecent movies—the recent formation of the League of Decency, with Catholic, Protestant and Jewish support, shows what can be done when the religious forces in the community mean business. The lottery excitement in New York is another illustration. It was not twenty-four hours after the governmental bodies in that city had passed the measure establishing a municipal lottery, when the churches with one accord arose in outraged protest. All of which is everlastingly to the good! But why stop with evils of this kind? Are there not other social evils even more ghastly in their consequences, and equally immoral in their essential nature, which should be fought by organized religion on a united and aggressive front? Take political corruption, for example! Now and again an indecent politician, like Ex-Mayor Walker, of New York, will arouse the opposition of the churches; but it is few churches rather than many that are active—the great majority remain more or less inert. Then there is the question of labor—if not specific technical disputes as in the longshoremen's strike in San Francisco and the great textile strike in the East and South, then the horrible brutality and utter lawlessness with which these strikes are fought by the dictatorial powers of the capitalistically owned governments! Against such murder of civil rights and constitutional guarantees of liberty, why are not the churches heard in a voice to shake the nation? The Negro question is another illustration. We venture to suggest that the protest of the churches in this country against the oppression of the Jews in Germany—a magnificently righteous protest!—has yet far exceeded in volume and intensity any protest against the oppression of the Negroes right here at home. There are no bounds to the moral law. Justice and mercy are involved in all relations between men. Let the churches therefore make life itself their field!

The supreme men of our time—who are they? There are, or have been, four men who alone among all the millions of this age of history are destined to be remembered so long as man has memory. There are generations in the past which have given one man to the immemorial future—others which have given eight or ten. Ours, it seems to us, has given four whom the most distant posterity will not forget. *First* among these is MAHATMA GANDHI, of whom it may be said more truly than the English historian, R. H. Green, said of Washington—that he is "the noblest figure who ever stood in the forefront of a nation's life." But Gandhi is more than a national leader—he is a world savior. The Mahatma's real rank is with the Buddha and the Christ. *Second* is NICOLAI LENIN, the Russian revolutionist, who in an hour of chaotic stress, delivered a people from disaster, and laid deep and sure the foundations of a new civilization. We may accept or reject Lenin's policies, like or dislike the man; but we must all agree that his colossal genius achieved one of the few supreme feats of human statesmanship. *Third,* ALBERT EINSTEIN, the "monarch of the mind"! To say that this scientist is the greatest thinker of his time is not enough. It must be added that in all the history of thought, there are only two names. Aristotle and Newton, to match his own. Last of these immortal four we would name SIGMUND FREUD. As Columbus discovered new continents in the outer world, so this Viennese psychologist discovered new continents in the inner world of the mind. In addition, he conceived and formulated a technique, like the art of navigation, for exploring these unknown regions of men's life. These are the supreme figures of this age. Not wholly lost is a world which can produce such men, for in their very genius is the promise of new worlds yet to be upon this earth.

Though the Heavens Fall

One of the most pernicious influences in any civilization is the moralist who is forever crying, "Let justice be done though the heavens fall!" He insists upon having his way until the heavens do fall, and then where is he with all his pet devices? Just where he and they belong, if they are at the bottom of the heap.

Sometimes he is a professional moralist, but usually he is moral merely while he surrounds his own pet purposes with an aura of "principle." He will sometimes subject himself to great personal inconvenience and cost to vindicate his precious "truth." He will sue his neighbor and vigorously collect a judgment of fifteen dollars for damage to his property or dignity, though it cost him a hundred and fifty dollars in lawyer and court fees. He is almighty for the "principle of the thing at any cost."

But he is at his worst when he is directing great social movements and presuming to represent great social causes. He wins Pyrrhic victories with enormous gusto, and sees the cause for which he contended go down in the universal crash, still smug in the assurance that he was right.

Europe today is full of such moralists. Whole nations have developed the mania. Every modern war has been brought on by them, and they will probably be found busy in the instigation of every broil of nations or social classes in the future. Almost any difference between individuals and groups could be settled amicably if this malignant stubbornness which seeks to hallow itself with moral sanctions did not force itself into the situation.

Nothing which inflames passions, and pits man against man or class against class in deadly conflict, embodies a principle worth preserving. Justice is never established with fire-brand and sword. The larger, secure justice almost always comes of somebody's willingness to suffer injustice. The highest morality lies in the capacity to let a stubborn opponent have his immoral way. Injustice is its own nemesis. Any one who wins an unfair advantage suffers immeasurably greater penalties in the undisturbed possession of his gains than his embittered opponent can possibly inflict by spiteful retaliation.

The calf that insists upon having all the rope will hang himself eventually; you do not need to bother about doing it for him.

The ethics which would have us turn the other when smitten on one cheek, and travel twain when forced to go one mile, is greatly discounted by the maudlin sentiment with which its sublime effectiveness is often obscured. But it is, when revealed in its bare vigor, the plainest common sense. It is the only way to get along, and stay where you have gotten.

Any man or social class or nation that is forever determined to win strict justice for himself or itself is not only a bane to all the rest of the people in the world but is doomed to certain defeat of the very purpose so madly cherished. The attainment of evenly balanced justice is impossible, and those who insist upon getting it do the greatest of injustice.

Our own social and industrial life is being embroiled by political and industrial leaders who have never learned this lesson, and who are inflaming multitudes to believe that we can fight bloody battles and justify them by prating of justice. Justice and bloody battles do not go together.

It looks as though a sane public opinion would have speedily to call down a plague upon both of the industrial houses which are now embroiling large sections of the land. Each side to the conflict will have eventually to appeal to the public to adjudicate the justice of its claims. The decision can never be reached in favor of either, for both are sacrificing all the sanctities of a just social order.

The tenacious claims of one side and then of the other that it cannot yield this principle nor submit to that injustice is piffle which can never deceive the unprejudiced. No principle is sacred, and no justice is inviolate which must be maintained through the wreck of industry and the blood of the victims of social insanity.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Jottings

Hitler has warned America that we must "buy more or lose trade." In the face of this dead giveaway, who can doubt any longer the great success of the boycott?

Every crazy currency scheme and utopian dream springs from one delusion—that money grows on trees, or flows inexhaustibly from government vaults, or can be printed interminably by government presses. Can we never get into the public mind the simple fact that wealth is produced by labor, that every dollar spent has first to be earned by somebody's grime and sweat?

We think we have great newspapers in this country. The New York *Times* publishes close to 500,000 copies a day, the Chicago *Tribune* ("the World's Greatest Newspaper!") over 800,000 copies, and the New York Tabloid, the *Daily News,* over 1,250,000 copies. But what are these as compared to the Bolshevik newspaper *Pravda,* published in Moscow, which issues a daily edition of 8,000,000 copies?

The publishers of the English "Who's Who" publishes also editions of "Who Was Who." It must be a terrible experience to find one's name transferred from the former to the latter.

Credit one beneficent achievement to repeal! The New York Coffee and Sugar exchange reports that coffee drinkers of the United States consumed 16.3 cups *less* of coffee each on the average during 1934, the first full year of legal liquor drinking.

How much longer does Postmaster Farley propose to withstand the contempt and outrage of this country? There must be a limit to a man's impudence —yet we tremble when we remember that there is a limitless universe.

J. H. H.

From Our Washington Correspondent

The brilliant Washington gathering of seven hundred dinner guests in the white and gold banquet room of the Mayflower Hotel on February 12th proves all by itself the remarkable change in status of the American Birth Control movement since its beginning twenty-one years ago. It was to honor the coming of age of this movement and Margaret Sanger's courageous leadership of it that this distinguished group came together. The long speakers' table was full of celebrities and the tables in front were filled with pioneers in the movement and members of Congress and judges and well known doctors. Extra tables crowded the alcoves and even the upstairs balcony. What a transformation since our unpopular days!

Mrs. Sanger is now working for legislation, the most difficult part of any reform movement, and, unfortunately, not too popular even with all believers in birth control. Her bill to legalize the dissemination of information about contraceptives, although recently defeated in the Judiciary Committee of the House by a vote of fifteen to eight was reintroduced on the day of the banquet by Congressman Walter M. Pierce of Oregon. It has been tabled again since then but enough intensive work is planned to change the minds of some of those fifteen Congressmen.

Although the program of speeches was long, everyone stayed until 11:30 to hear the speech by Margaret Sanger. Her new proposal is the establishment of a federal population bureau to survey our human resources and study the effect of population on crime and delinquency, and problems relating to unemployment. "If under the very eyes of our social agencies," she said, "and with their help and assistance this increase comes from the physical and mental defectives, the diseased, helpless and destitute, then truly they and those governmental agencies behind them are creating a national Frankenstein."

The slow action of the medical profession was condemned by one of its progressive members, Dr. Prentiss Wilson, and a review of Mrs. Sanger's career was given by Charles Francis Potter. Chicago's Rachel Yarros added the vivid human appeal which is her specialty.

The oldest speakers were Harriet Stanton Blatch of Nyack and Lucretia M. Blankenburg of Philadelphia. Their talks were short and practical, clarifying the need for favorable legislation. They both had the forward look of youthful courage.

Mrs. Sanger's organization, the National Committee on Federal Legislation for Birth Control, is directing its bold campaign from pleasant offices at 1343 H Street, Northwest, aiming for a million signatures to its petition with special attention to the districts of those fifteen opposing congressmen.

One of the powerful drawing cards was the presence of Pearl S. Buck whose tribute to Margaret Sanger was very touching. Full excerpts from her discussion follow:

"Of all the countries in which I have lived, whose people I have observed, it seems to me the people of this country, my own country, suffer most acutely, morally and mentally, from maladjustment in sex life."

"I have always been proud to be American, I am glad I am an American, and the people of whom I am a part interest me as do no others in the world. I find here in this country of mine the most extraordinary and the most fascinating variety, not only variety in landscape, in custom, in food, in language, but in race, in tradition, in religion, in achievement." . . . "and nowhere is this variety more apparent than in the very attitude of which I speak, of the most dismaying moral conditions with the most complete refusal to see or to recognize what is going on. The sin here, I discover, is not to do the thing termed immoral, but to have it become known. Whisper behind the hand, snicker behind the door, but in the open, no. The morals of the nation must be upheld. Even those in high places may violate the moral code and it is nothing though it is known, if it be not spoken out."

"In all those countries where population is too abundant, the cause of the individual is lost. The result of too little to eat, too little opportunity to achieve, too constant and fierce a struggle for barely enough upon which to feed the body is a state of mind which stultifies original and creative thinking, and breeds that type of dull patience which more than any religion, even, is responsible for a stolid fatalism, which is a sort of death. It is the curse of the Orient, except Japan. Japan is solving her population problem by expansion. But are *we* to be forced to expansion again? Are *we* to take part also in fierce wars for lands and territories that our people may live? It seems to me that the choice is inevitably in one of three ways: we will sink into the apathy of the semi-starved, or we will wage expensive and debasing wars for land that we may have food, or we will decide what we ought to have as our population and disseminate the information needed." . . .

"There have been codes on some subjects which have been partially satisfactory, such as the old system of marriage in China, which made marriage a family matter, so that when a man was married the first time, his parents chose for him the woman most suited to the family. But Chinese society, eminently sane always, recognized also the individual human need, and they realized that a man needed a certain romantic satisfaction, too. In short, he needed love, as all humans do. So the system, having satisfied society, satisfied the individual, too, and recognized the man's right to choose another woman, a woman for himself, and accepted her and her children, gave them the right to the family name, their place under the family roof, and their share in the family inheritances. I do not advocate the system, but the results for the Chinese were satisfactory, in all but one respect. There were no spinsters, no illegitimate children, there were no unmarried mothers, there were no dissatisfied husbands—or there should not have been! But the important failure was that there were many dissatisfied wives." . . .

"Chinese society at least faced one of the problems of human nature and attempted to create a system in which its instincts could be wisely and properly satisfied with the least detriment to society as a whole. We are not willing to face that reality. I do not know a nation more absorbed in matters of sex than we are, if one is to judge by our literature, our art, our advertisements, our newspapers, and the facts revealed behind the hand or the closed door of neighbors. It is obvious that we are not more continent than other people, not more controlled, not more monogamous, either in fact or in instinct. The result is appalling in the amount of secret and illegitimate, and therefore unhappy sex life." . . .

. . . . "Intelligent and open understanding is to my mind one of the things that Margaret Sanger is helping us to achieve, and it will have its far reaching effect not only upon this one matter of birth control, but upon

our whole national mind. It is to our shame that as a nation we say so often, 'There is so much sordid and shameful in life that at least I don't want to hear or read about it.' It amounts to a national attitude. In Heaven's name, if we will not allow ourselves to hear or to see or to speak, how can the sordidness and the shame ever be done away with in our life? How can we ever discover what makes the shame and the evil if we will not even know what it is? What is this stupidity which will not distinguish between leering pornography being sent secretly through the mails, and clean scientific knowledge openly distributed to relieve distress and suffering? What is this attitude toward the very human instinct to which we all owe our existence? .... What is the meaning of all this pretense? We are a nation of pretenders. I do not say hypocrites, mind you, for hypocrisy is conscious. A hypocrite is one who knows he is evil and pretends he is good. But we will not even know what we are. We refuse to know. We sit with our feet in the mud and wave our little imaginary wings and pretend we are in Heaven. We are not. We are human beings in this world immersed now in extraordinarily simple and basic human problems, the problems of mature nationhood. For our pioneer days are over. The days of our childhood are passed,—the days of more land to be settled, more work to be found, more room everywhere. We are grown now, and it is time to stop thinking that we are better than other people or that we can escape their problems."

.... "We need to face our country as it really is, not only economically, but spiritually and morally. What are we? How are our people really living and thinking behind this white-washed fence of moral talk and creed? What are the morals by which we are really living? If they are not those which we profess in our churches and in our national bills, then why not? I, for one, stand by the people. If they are not living as they profess to live, then the odds are not that their ways of life should change, but that the professions should change. For I believe in the integrity of people. Most of us do the best we can under existing conditions. If we are not able to live under the codes of our forefathers, it is not because we do not want to, but because life has changed so that we cannot, and we want help. The harm to the spirit comes not in the change, but in having to pretend there is no need to change."

How Fares the League of Nations?

[*From Our Special Correspondent*]

Clouds of incense have arisen round the League of Nations. "Long live the League of Nations down by the Lake of Geneva; it has saved the world from war; it is the majestic guardian of peace between nations, of justice between peoples, of fairness and of truth." This has been said with flowers, it has been sung in chorus.

What is it that has happened? What is the jubilation about? Great events, great victories. The quarrel between Jugoslavia and Hungary has been made up, and it has been agreed to send international troops to the Saar in order to ensure quiet during the voting.

The League of Nations is the hope of all. If the world is to be saved from war there is nowhere else to turn and therefore we look to it and our hope has been fulfilled and our faith strengthened. There will be no war. And the world sang hymns and praised the League of Nations, for without it there would have been war, if not concerning Jugoslavia then about the Saar.

The war, therefore, hangs just above our heads. No wonder we are pleased with the League of Nations for preserving us; if indeed it was the League. As a matter of fact, it was a large section of the world's press that with gigantic headlines told us beforehand that "all depends on the Great Powers," that "they alone are able to prevent war," and for once in a while it was the headlines that spoke the truth. It is the Great Powers who decide and they do not want war, either over Jugoslavia's grievance or over the Saar. Therefore, we did not get war and neither should we have had war had there been no League of Nations. When the Great Powers do not want war, then the League of Nations rescues us.

But how does it rescue us? The outcome of the settlement of the Jugoslavian-Hungarian dispute is the resolution unanimously accepted by the League Council for an international convention regarding political exiles suspected of participating in terrorist movements. When this convention comes into force any political refugee might be expelled from his temporary home of refuge at the request of a government. The lot of political exiles is a very hard one. The League of Nations has made it still harder by introducing this resolution. Are not the existing police regulations strong enough to cope with terrorist activities in different countries? Thanks to the probable introduction of this new convention we may soon confront the problem of seeing Jews in Germany or Social-Democrats in the Saar quietly massacred. A man like Subhas Chandra Bose may well find all the frontiers closed to him.

And what happened when Japan attacked China and broke Art. 12, 13 and 15 of the League's Pact? Did the League then stop Japan by the means laid down in Art. 16 of the Pact? Did all the members of the League treat Japan as their enemy or did they all, contrary to the wording of the Pact, export war materials equally to the attacked and to the lawbreakers?

And when Sir Stafford Cripps questioned Sir John Simon as to how far England would disregard her pledge to "respect and preserve the territorial integrity of China against attack" which, according to Art. 10 of the Pact, they had undertaken to do, England's Foreign Secretary replied word by word as follows: "Art. 10 in the Covenant of the League of Nations does not aim specially at the territorial inviolability of China. ... What the article states applies quite generally."

As in the case of Japan and China, so it was with Paraguay and Bolivia when they broke the Pact and started war. Instead of endeavoring to get the war stopped, all the members of the League who manufactured arms, broke the Pact and kept the war going by selling arms to the combatants.

And what happened in Manchuria will probably be repeated in Abyssinia. The Ethiopian Government would like to see the application of Art. 11 of the Pact of the League of Nations for preserving its territorial integrity. But are the League Powers at all interested in this appeal? M. Laval had friendly conversations

with the Duce. What actually transpired in Rome we do not know. But about one thing we are pretty sure, namely, France wants to have Italy's support in maintaining the present position of Austria; and for this purpose she must make some concessions to the Italian Government and most likely she will condone the action of the Italian forces in the Abyssinian frontier.

Thus do they speak, thus do they act there in the League of Nations to whom all look with trust! The great and exalted idea of a League of Nations was the peace of the world on the basis of equal rights between great and small nations. Consequently each country should have a vote and all votes should have equal value, but in the present League of Nations the right constantly lies on the side of the might.

Who took account of Italy before Mussolini armed it? Who heard what Germany said in the League of Nations so long as she was disarmed? Now there is no doubt that statesmen have discovered the air route to Rome and that in Geneva the chair stands ready for Hitler's representative.

Statesmen have short memories. They who sit in the League of Nations have already forgotten the story of the three Chinese provinces which Japan conquered. They have forgotten that they left China in the lurch and that the result was the failure of the Disarmament Conference and the arming of the whole world. They have forgotten that after a year's deliberation they refused to recognize Manchuria in order, however theoretically, to condemn Japan's invasion of conquest, and the breach of the covenant by all.

Now when the recognition comes—and it is already expected—then the League of Nations has not only gone against its Pact by giving Japan a free hand in China but also given itself the lie. Since it has acknowledged the right of the conqueror, it has taken the ground from under its own feet.

When the Disarmament Conference, in the name of justice, gave Germany the right to take part in the race for armaments, thus after the fifteen years' work of the League of Nations, we were exactly where we were in 1914. We shall get war when one of the Great Powers wants war. We have had war in progress for two years between Paraguay and Bolivia and since 1931, the constant use of the force of arms by Japan in Manchuria.

If there is any difference between the situation then and now, it is worse. The Covenant pledges the members to appeal to the League in every dispute and "under no circumstances to resort to war until after three months have elapsed." But according to the opinion of all military and political experts the next war will be a war of aggression. In 1914, however, the declaration of war was still respected.

Under the leadership of the League of Nations we have war hanging over our heads. Alliances have been concluded. The materials of warfare are ready and the dictatorship of a Great Power is law in 1935 as it was in 1914.

Peace cannot be ushered in with lawlessness and war cannot be abolished by a dictatorship.

Geneva, Switzerland ELLEN HÖRUP.

An Observer in Japan

That Japan is more western than the west is a cliche one hears as often as that Japanese bankers always employ Chinese tellers because they are more honest. Neither are true. On the surface Japan has acquired a smear of westernization. To compete with the commercialism of the west this was imperative.

When we arrived in Yokohama we were whisked off to Tokyo an hour away in an expensive American motor car and installed with all the comforts of home in Frank Lloyd Wright's gloomy Imperial Hotel. The streets were filled with more motor cars, mostly American, and untold numbers of bicycles. Street cars, motor buses and elevated trains rushed by. The buildings were as modern as those in Chicago or New York, though not so high. Stores had plate glass windows and department stores vied with anything our big cities offer in the way of spaciousness, display of goods and polite clerks. When I attempted to buy a Japanese picture book to take home to my children I could find nothing in three stores but translations of Mickey Mouse. New school buildings emulated modern German structures and their curriculum seemed almost as cut and dried as our own public school system. Men and school children wore for the most part European clothes. So did many factory girls and office clerks.

But Tokyo is not Japan and when one scratches the surface of this cosmopolitan capital one finds that although economically life is organized on western models, socially and spiritually there is a wide gulf between Japanese and occidental patterns of life.

The first thing that bothered me was that only men rode bicycles. Women's bicycles are apparently not even made. While the streets teemed with men on wheels women and girls walked, usually with a baby strapped on their backs. The second was that at the many official banquets to which we were invited few Japanese women were ever present.

The longer we stayed in Japan the more I was impressed with the inferior position women in Japan possessed. They have no political status, their marriages are still for the most part arranged by parents and though they have entered the industrial world in great numbers they are paid less than men for the same work and often treated no better than peons. Girls may still be sold by their parents for debts and it is customary to contract them out to geisha houses or factory owners for a period of years. Many factories maintain dormitories where they house their female labor and control their comings and goings much like a strict boarding school. Prostitution is legalized and the law does not recognize a single standard of morality. If a couple are divorced the wife legally is never entitled to her children. Liberal judges have recently been known to award children to the mother in extreme cases, but quite outside the law. The average Japanese man does not take his wife to the movies with him or to any other social entertainment. Girls have been educated for centuries to be the servants of men either in the capacity of geishas or as wives and the mothers of children. They fulfill these functions with dignity and humility yet their very humility belongs to a social scheme radically different from our own.

There was a time when Japanese womanhood flowered in more independent paths. But since 1598 Japan has been completely and closely organized as a military government. The subjection of women is a necessity

in the pattern of a militarized society. We see this exemplified in fascist Italy and Germany. But in Japan there has been a long history of loyalty, a loyalty which is at the same time a religion. It has demanded the subservience of men as well as women. Women are simply a lower category. In spite of the most advanced teaching in science in the universities every Japanese student is early imbued with the belief that the emperor is divinely descended. No Japanese would care to question this belief in public. And upon this supposition is based the patriotism and religion of a whole nation. Shintoism or ancestor worship is a religion of patriotism, a religion of dead heroes and patriots. Filial piety and obedience extends through society from the family group to its semi-divine head. Social discipline requires that personality be suppressed. The individual does not count. In ancient Japan the sacrifice of life by harikiri or other equally horrible (to us) methods was common. Life is still cheerfully thrown away where the service of the emperor is concerned.

It is impossible to make judgments or to understand modern political developments unless we attempt to understand the different code of morality which exists in the orient. Travelling on our transpacific boat was a Japanese prince and his wife who had been on a round-the-world goodwill tour. Their steamer chairs were elevated on the principle that even distant connections of the emperor must be above ordinary creatures. Soon after we landed in Japan a prominent English language newspaper was severely censured by the police for referring to the children of this couple as "children" instead of "princes." In Tokyo no building may be constructed higher than the emperor's palace for none must look down on the emperor. Not long ago an incident was reported in our press which may illustrate the great gulf between American psychology and that of the Japanese.

The emperor was scheduled to visit a normal school in a small town of some 65,000 souls. The minister of education was to receive him at the school. The emperor and his cortege arrived at the railroad station. The police sergeant in charge of routing the emperor's party through the town and to the school became confused and took a short cut. His imperial highness arrived at the school twenty minutes earlier than was scheduled. The minister of education was unprepared to receive him, the school in a flurry of last minute preparations. Any American can picture what would have happened if such an incident had happened to President Roosevelt. The police sergeant would have been censured by his superiors, possibly dismissed and teased unmercifully by his fellow policemen. Nothing more serious would have happened. But in Japan such a blunder became a national incident. The police sergeant seated himself before the family shrine and attempted to commit suicide by slashing his throat. He was disgraced and ruined for life and his family and superior officers shared his dishonor. The minister of the interior contemplated resignation and the government considered that perhaps the whole cabinet should resign in humiliation for this miscarriage of arrangements and indignity to the emperor. The day after the incident the entire population of the town stood one minute in silence in the public square to ask forgiveness for the inconvenience caused the emperor.

Unquestioning loyalty and obedience permeate a book of stories offered as a farewell gift by an organization known as the Foreign Affairs Association which publishes the quarterly, "Contemporary Japan." The leaders of this organization are important men in Japan. Some have been ambassadors or foreign ministers and many have been educated abroad. The book is entitled "Sakura No Kaori or The Fragrance of Cherry Blossoms." Its contents are in English which alone would indicate that this portrayal of Japan is as its leaders would like it understood abroad. Cherry blossoms are the symbol of the sacrificial courage of youth. These anecdotes are dedicated to the spirits of the men who fell in the Shanghai and Manchurian incidents. One of these found its way into the international press in those troubled days. It tells of a young bride who committed suicide on the eve of her husband's departure for Manchuria. Before slashing her throat she had prepared the customary feast dishes to celebrate her husband's departure. An affectionate letter explained that she was doing her bit so that her husband need have nothing to worry about at home but could devote his heart and soul to fighting for his country. Another tells of a farewell letter sent by a group of fifth year school boys to a teacher going to the front. In order to express their "gratitude and true sentiments" they had written the letter, which hoped that their teacher would fight bravely and distinguish himself, in their own blood.

Another tale recounts how a 45 year old lieutenant took leave of his wife and five children, the last but a week old. Said she,

> I am the wife of a Japanese Officer. I am ready to accept whatever comes. Never will I do anything that may disgrace your name. You need not worry about me. Fight bravely, very bravely—die an honorable death. Goodbye.
>
> Of course (said the lieutenant) I will bravely fight. I will slash the enemy with my sword as long as my strength lasts. I shall die a glorious death like a true warrior of Japan. You wait with the children for me to come home in a cinerary jar.

But his commander had made other plans. For the sake of his family responsibilities he ordered the lieutenant to remain in charge of the home guard. The lieutenant was chagrined. He knew he could not return to his wife without first receiving his baptism of fire on the battlefield. To his commander he replied,

> Your order shall be obeyed. When, however, the fighting is over, I shall like a true samurai, disembowel myself in your presence.

When the captain asked for an explanation he replied,

> Because I am apparently of no use in battle. I am no better than a worn out straw sandal cast on the rubbish heap. I am dishonestly taking the Government money. To punish myself for having swindled my pay out of our Government for so many years I shall dispose of myself by committing harikiri under your very eyes.

The final paragraph of this little book says,

> Many words are not needed for the soldier who lives constantly in the World of Non-Self. Tenno-Heika (His Majesty the Emperor) is more than enough. In this one word everything is found; and from this one word, everything comes. The courage and strength of our Soldiers, the power of our Army and Navy, and the glory of our Nation, they all spring from this one word Tenno-Heika.

How much easier it is for fascist reaction to control a nation which has so unique a history of patriotism and central control. In the name of divinity its armies penetrate other lands, its press is controlled, its spy system developed, free speech and assemblage forbidden, and the public opinion of the rest of the world flouted. The Japanese moreover are submissive in spite of being 99% literate. The Russian aristocracy deliberately kept its peasantry illiterate. But if the Japanese

proletariat can be controlled more easily by written propaganda it can also be more easily reached by counter-propaganda.

A nation that has been so thoroughly trained to hide every trace of emotion does not show its unrest to an outside world. But there are those in Japan who believe that the militarist program for territorial expansion spells future disaster for their country. There are those who consider that taxation is fast becoming unendurable and that the huge proletariat may one day shake off the control of a handful of wealthy families. There are men and women who admire the political liberties of the west and would have them for their own country. Who they are and what their strength is only the future will show.

DOROTHY WALTON.

Geography and World Peace

The individualist believes that ruthless competition and its concomitant antagonism are the primary factors in social progress; that certain individuals, nations and races are naturally superior to other individuals, nations and races; that the law of the struggle for existence operates inexorably in human society and results in the survival of the fittest; that the losers in the competitive struggle should be left to welter in dire poverty and thereby provide a way for their own extinction; that war is nature's pruning-hook for keeping the human orchard healthy and virile; that mass homicide advances civilization.

The foregoing doctrine of individualism is known in sociology as "the philosophy of force." It is the ideology upon which all class and predatory social systems rest, and constitutes a complete negation of science, common sense and the moral law of reciprocity, which is commonly called the Golden Rule.

Sir Henry Maine, one of the world's great lawyers, used the philosophy of force in his defense of aristocracy and the House of Lords, and made it a part of his indictment of democracy that "the multitude evidently dislikes the doctrine of the struggle for existence," to which he refers as

> . . . that beneficent private war which makes one man strive to climb on the shoulders of another and remain there through the law of the survival of the fittest.

II

In international relations the philosophy of force is called "militarism," a method which is regarded by business men, statesmen, military officers and "patriotic" societies as a biological and sociological necessity.

Theodore Roosevelt, in his book, "The Strenuous Life," declares that

> . . . in this world the nation that has trained itself to a career of unwarlike ease is bound, in the end, to go down before other nations which have not lost the manly and adventurous qualities.

Baron Karl von Stengel, a socially-myopic jurist who was one of Germany's delegates at the first Hague Peace Conference, asserts that

> Great states like Germany and Italy are welded into nationalities only through blood and iron. Storm purifies the air and destroys the frail trees, leaving the sturdy oak standing. War is a test of a nation's political, physical, and intellectual worth. The State in which there is much that is rotten may vegetate for a while in peace, but in war its weaknesses are revealed.
>
> * * *
>
> Germany's preparations for war have not resulted in economic disaster, but in unexampled economic expansion, unquestionably because of our demonstrated superiority over France.

Even the socialist Ruskin has held that war is the source of all that is good in human life:

> War is the foundation of all the arts . . . of all the high virtues and faculties of men. . . . There is no great art possible to a nation but that which is based on battle. . . .
>
> * * *
>
> All great nations learned their truth of word, and strength of thought, in war; they were nourished in war and wasted by peace; taught by war and deceived by peace; trained by war and betrayed by peace.

In his "Apostrophe to War," Rear Admiral Yates Sterling Jr., U. S. N., asserts that

> War, you have become the foundation of all human virtues;
> Nations have found cohesion in war and dispersion in peace;
> Wisdom in war and deception in peace;
> Training in war and betrayal in peace.
> Nations have been born in war and expire in peace.
> War, you teach men how to die, while peace shows them only how to live.
> War, you cleanse the world; peace litters it with corruption.

These quotations, favoring the doctrine that collective homicide is the cause of human progress, could be multiplied by thousands from the literature of all nations. The idea that war has advanced civilization is almost universal in the minds of the human race, and the persons who are imbued with it are found in the first ranks of the social and political hierarchy.

Nor is this philosophy confined to the privileged, and therefore conservative classes. The Communist and the Social Democrat—brothers under the skin to the Legionnaire and the Daughter of the American Revolution—while denouncing international war, look upon class war as the ultimate method of resolving current social problems.

The Communist frankly says that inasmuch as the capitalist system is maintained by force and terror over the masses, who are kept purposely in ignorance by the privileged and predatory class, educational and democratic methods are futile and that therefore the existing regime must be abolished by force wielded by a minority group of militant workers.

The Socialist on the other hand, regardless of his pacific professions, will, in times of crisis, espouse force to combat counter-revolution or to prevent the suppression of his party (the recent Socialist rebellions in Austria and Spain are cases in point); and almost invariably he looks upon war as unavoidable under capitalism and upon force as the final arbiter of social destiny.

The Socialist, seeing that war eventuates as a result of the imperialist struggle among capitalists in the backward countries, maintains that in order to eliminate war we must strike at its roots and abolish the competitive capitalist system.

Thus according to the conservative, war is rooted in nature and in human nature; according to the radical it is rooted in the capitalist system; and according to both it is inevitable.

III

As a matter of fact, war is rooted neither in human nature nor in the capitalist system.

Man's current (and possibly passing) superiority over all other species of animal life is due to his intellectual faculties, which have been de-

veloped as a result of his social instincts and habits, which lead him to aid and defend his fellows.

All the scientific evidence which we possess goes to show that man is a social animal, that his progenitors were social beings, that society—beginning with the family—is based upon mutual aid, sympathy and reciprocity: upon cooperation, understanding and the Golden Rule. Man's struggle with man is of his own choosing and finds no sanction in Darwin's theory; it is not grounded in nature, but in a psychological attitude, in the belief that the use of force is morally and scientifically justifiable in resolving civil and international problems.

War cannot be grounded in capitalism, as most radicals think, for it antedates capitalism and is used by primitive communistic groups to settle intertribal quarrels; and it will be used by the socialist nations of the future, unless the radicals should abandon the superstition that the interests of the working classes can be advanced and made secure by the use of force.

That the clash of rival armaments inevitably follows trade war is belied by the fact that the Quakers, who have been pioneer traders and intrepid capitalists for centuries, never resort to, nor advocate, the use of force, because they are psychologically immune to this method of settling disputes. Wherever proper educational methods have been reciprocally applied, as in the case of Canada and the United States, the resultant moral disarmament renders a resort to force to settle capitalistic quarrels unthinkable.

The radical, like the conservative, has yet to learn that tools are sources of moral ideas; that their use colors all human values and determines the structure of society; that tasks are always sought to fit existing tools; and that the only effective gatling-guns for the preservation of any social system are the printing press and the spoken word.

Man is the only living organism that is hostile to, and wages war on, his own kind. Dog does not eat dog; tiger does not war upon tiger; wolf wars on sheep, but not upon wolf—even the loathsome hyena and the wolverine live at peace with their own kind. But man hates man, man kills man, all because of an attitude of mind which is rooted largely in sheer fear—fear of that which is foreign, strange, different, unknown or misunderstood. Bertrand Russel says:

> At the present time the fiercest and most dangerous animal with which human beings have to contend is man, and the dangers arising from purely physical causes have been very rapidly reduced. In the present day, therefore, fear finds little scope except in relation to other human beings, and fear itself is one of the main reasons why human beings are formidable to each other.
>
> * * *
>
> It is a recognized maxim that the best defence is attack; consequently people are continually attacking each other because they expect to be attacked. Our instinctive emotions are those that we have inherited from a much more dangerous world, and contain, therefore, a larger proportion of fear than they should; this fear, since it finds little outlet elsewhere, directs itself against the social environment, producing distrust and hate, envy, malice, and all uncharitableness.

Thus we see that war is the child of fear and hate, which are generated by misunderstanding, which is identical with ignorance. Whether there are any instincts at all is a disputed question among psychologists; but that fear and hate are no longer "instinctive," if they ever were, that they do not lead "naturally" to war, is attested by the fact that eighty per cent of the soldiers of the World War had to be drafted into service, and their fears and hates kept alive by a constant stream of lying propaganda.

Therefore, war is the result of an attitude which vanishes under the impact of understanding; and understanding—which is synonymous with culture—is the spiritual residue of education.

IV

Man's open and flagrant violation of Article One of Nature's great Code of Creation, which insists upon mutual aid, goodwill and peace among the members of the same species, has carried him to a point where he now faces the possibility of complete annihilation; and if he is too stupid to assert himself as the master of the earth and cooperate with his fellows in the struggle against his physical environment—against disease, drought and flood; against earthquake and erosion; against organized insects which prey upon plant and tree—instead of against the social environment, there are thousands of other candidates willing and eager to dominate a planet grown topheavy with battleships, arsenals and siege guns.

The only hope for man's survival on his native earth—the only home he has known or can know—lies in inculcating universally the fact that we are all fellow passengers on one and the same rock-ship, sailing we know not whence nor whither through the uncharted seas of heaven; that we are all of us equally responsible for the wretchedness which curses the human family; that each is his brother's keeper; that the weal of others leads to happiness for ourselves, that the woe of one—if allowed to continue—will eventuate in the destruction of all!

Through the clumsy ignorance of our ancestors we have inherited a meretricious and obsolete tool, the tool of force which is incapable of serving any rational purpose in human relations; and the attitude which built and perpetuates this imposing but monstrous instrument must be replaced by the ideal of world or planetary citizenship, an ideal that can best be instilled in the minds of youth through the channel of geography: the science of the earth's surface, form, physical features, natural and political divisions, climate, productions and population.

Today geography cannot be taught from the leaden-eyed viewpoint of the professional patriot and militarist, nor can the map of the United States be drawn as was that of medieval Rome, with the rest of the world consigned to outer darkness.

The great facts for the teacher to keep before his class are that the fundamental activities of other peoples, whether they live next door or in the antipodes, are identical with our own; that difference does not constitute inferiority; that other peoples' governments may be inferior to our own, but that our own is far from perfect and in process of evolution; that other peoples are superior to us in some ways: that the Indian excels in many kinds

of handicraft, the French in art, the Russian in music and drama, the Chinese in ethics and good manners, the German in science, the Eskimo in marine craftsmanship, etc.

Whether he knows it or not, the geography teacher is the Atlas upon whose shoulders rests the fate of humanity. It is he who has the greatest opportunity to teach respect or disrespect for other peoples, to show that a diversity of cultures and customs is compatible with a unity of purpose for mankind as a whole, to inculcate understanding or misunderstanding, to help towards peace and world organization or help towards antagonism, fear, hate and war.

In the geography (fourth dimension of history) class, better than anywhere else, can be prepared the way for a new order of justice, cooperation and brotherhood; and upon the proper instruction of youth in this science depends the salvation of the human world. Understanding, respect, appreciation, sympathy, friendship, goodwill: these are the spiritual possibilities of the geography class, the factors which constitute the attitude of the higher citizenship, the attitude which will yet bury the tool of force under a better method and relegate war into the limbo whence has gone the personal duel—into the tomb of dead barbarisms!

RALPH WESTLAKE.

National Law Against Lynching*

Yesterday in conversation with a southern white man in Atlanta, I found that we agreed on these two general propositions:

That a community that permits a lynching, will not punish the lynchers. In the act of permitting the lynching the community has committed itself, has become compromised, and must exonerate the individuals in self-defense.

The second proposition is: *That there is no adequate substitute for local civilization.* In a country whose government is organized like ours, local units of government will have far more to do with the life and happiness of its citizens than will the national administration.

But this southerner found it necessary also to agree that a national law against lynching is our next most logical step—as a corollary to the fundamental truth of that first proposition. Although the truth of that second proposition makes the enforcement of national law difficult in cases where local sentiment is opposed to the enforcement, still the record of our unpunished lynchings and the plain impotence of small local minorities which are opposed to the crime call logically and loudly for action on the part of our sovereign unit of government, the government that is least responsive to local and isolated prejudices.

At the very least, a national law could be counted upon to strengthen and encourage local sentiment and to give prestige and more power to the present helpless minorities that are actively opposed to lynching. Those who say "Leave it to the south!" are not logical, for they give voice to a pleasant theory of government which is not supported by the history and the facts of fifty years. The south, as well as South Africa and the south-sea islands, can be helped by outside influence—and this south is not foreign to the rest of the United States. Lynching is as much a national crime as is kidnaping, and has a much worse record. On the other hand, those who favor national anti-lynching legislation are also illogical if they expect national law to be omnipotent locally and one hundred per cent effective. They cite the effectiveness of the pursuit, prosecution and punishment of kidnapers; but local sentiment is entirely agreeable to, and even co-operative with, the federal attack on kidnapers. The kidnaper, as a lone wolf or as a member of a small gang, antagonizes the local community; while the lyncher, as a member of a great mob, which had nearly everybody's relatives or friends in it, comprises the local community and paralyzes local law. Even a national law, which must be administered largely through local agencies, would be handicaped, though in lesser degree.

For example, the kidnap-lynching of Claude Neal in Alabama and Florida undoubtedly makes the lynchers subject to the awful penalties of the Lindbergh law; and although many of us believe that the federal investigators and prosecutors should proceed against the malefactors, even if for no better reason than the defense of the law, still those of us who are in our right minds know that the national government would find almost insuperable difficulty in convicting any accused person before local judges and jurors. Even district federal courts are subject to local influence. Without dictatorship there is no appeal from the decision of the local jury, and the federal government seems to have no authority to try the accused outside of his state or district, or otherwise than by a jury "of his peers," which in a lynching case means a jury of his friends, sympathizers and fellow-lynchers. But a thorough testing out of such a law would achieve some good: if impassable constitutional barriers are found, constitutions can be amended. By exhausting every source under present laws, we would perhaps find the need for a more definite law. In cases where the mob does not act across a state line, procedure under present law seems utterly hopeless, and the need of a special federal law against lynching is clear.

Perhaps even in the interstate cases the Lindbergh law is too terrible to be effective—not more drastic than lynchers deserve, but too drastic to win the support of local sentiment. We have agreed that there is no effective substitute for local civilization in the enforcement of law, especially under the American system. There must be a law that will divide the local people and win over at least a part of them. All law is compromise anyway. The Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill has many of the elements which would give southern sentiment a chance to work in its behalf. That is indicated also by the demands from the south for such legislation.

I am writing on the road and without having a copy of the bill before me, but one problem which the proposed bill seems to ignore is the problem of *investigation* in lynching cases. Who is going to investigate lynchings and present the evidence to the district federal grand juries in order to secure indictments? Juries do not investigate for themselves. They sit and wait.

*This article, written by one of the most distinguished Negro leaders of America today, is of importance at this time when the proposed federal anti-lynching law is challenging support.—Editor.

The internal revenue and the treasury departments and even the postal service have their own investigators who bring cases to the grand juries. In the case of kidnaping, the department of justice has special investigators. We cannot trust the department of justice without specific law to investigate lynching cases—and it seems to me that we cannot trust the department of the present administration to take vigorous action under any circumstances. No private agency can do it; private agencies can only expose and protest. It is a task that demands government investigators, with government authority. This should be provided for in this bill, or by further legislation.

Since there is no substitute for local civilization, the most effective parts of such a law will be those which tend to encourage, persuade and coerce local authorities: namely, reasonable penalties to be assessed against local officials responsible for the peace of the community, and the officers accountable for the safety of prisoners and accused persons. All presumptions of guilt should lie against them when a lynching occurs. Some penalties should be automatic—such as removal from office of the officers who were in immediate charge of the prisoner and immediately responsible for order. If these removals are subject to review by courts, the burden of proof should be on those making the appeal: they should be required to show that neither by commission nor ommission were they guilty of encouraging, aiding or abetting the action of the mob. Such measures would put local authorities out of sympathy with mobs.

Penalties against mob members should be carefully graded: least severe against those who participate only by their presence, more severe against those who aid and abet, and most severe against those who actually do the murder. It is well known that every bystander is a psychological participant in mob-action. It would be easier to convict the leaders and active murderers. The great majority of lynchings could have been prevented by the local officers, if they had more of a stake in preventing than in permitting the crime. A national law against lynching should aim to make it worth their while.

WILLIAM PICKENS.

Fathers Are Not Liars

Every man hopes that his sons will do better than he has done. Some of us have succeeded in what we have undertaken but clearly see now how we might have been even more successful and wish to pass on to our sons by word of mouth the benefit of our experience. Others of us have been prevented, for some reason, from doing what we might have done, and it is our determination that in so far as we can we shall not let our sons be similarly handicapped. The extent to which we fathers seek to guide or shield our boys depends upon the depth of our experience.

I am in my early forties. I have two sons, the older of whom is finishing high school. Are there any things, judging by my experience, that I would like to see them avoid? Are there any things they might well do at my suggestion? Surely. There is not one of us but would answer yes. But the degree of our emphasis depends upon the degree of our success or suffering.

For one thing, I am trying to guide my sons clear of the religious nonsense that was drilled into me. As I look back over the years that have so quickly sped since my boyhood I see much precious time lost in other-wordliness. My attention is now given to doing what I can to make this day and this place as pleasant as possible. But it has not always been so. Most of my early life was spent in deep concern over the problem of whether or not I, and others for whom I might be responsible, was fit for the world to come. What a silly thing for a normal youth to be thinking about! But in the churches I attended that, I gathered, was the chief thing. Now that I am emancipated from such ideas shall I stand placidly by and see my sons taught as I was taught? I should say not! Life is too short to be spent learning and unlearning in this way. Therefore they do not attend Sunday school. There is no liberal church school near us so I teach them at home a very broad attitude toward religion.

I read the Bible to them and frankly tell them the truth about it. Why should I not let them know that the Creation stories, the magic fire of Elijah, Daniel in the lions' den and Jonah in the fish are all folklore? The value of Hebrew experience is not lost by admitting that these events never occurred. But dare I go the full length of reason and say to my boys that the traditional keystone belief in the resurrection of Jesus may be discarded? Why not? Is there any justification for looking upon the ancient past as unscientific and yet feel obliged to keep the belief that Jesus rose from the dead? Maybe he did, I tell them. But before it can mean anything to me it must be proved, which seems impossible at present. So the whole structure of religious belief on which I was reared collapses and I do not hesitate to say so. I would not even bother to instruct my boys in these matters were it not for the fact that the churches generally still adhere to so much of this outworn stuff. I feel sure if I can give them my point of view gained by years of hard experience they can get a head-start in life.

I am trying to teach not only my boys but other people over whom I have any influence a better way of life here and now. I once was motivated by a fear of hell and a hope of heaven. That is all gone except for its recurrence sometimes in half-conscious moments of sleep. Yet I am enthusiastic for social improvement and would be greatly disappointed if my boys grew up to be selfish and unsocial. I do not believe that a hope of future existence is necessary for an interest in a better economic order.

I want my boys to do what they want to do in life. That is something religion robbed me of. I wanted to be a physician. Perhaps it was a foolish choice, but anyway it was the only work I ever wanted to prepare for. I spent much of my time as a high school boy in a doctor's home. I went with him on many of his trips into the country to see his patients. We talked of my future, and planned that I should become a doctor. I was happy but for one thing: my tyrannical conscience kept reminding me that God had called me to be a preacher. Just what ever

put that into my head I cannot say. But somehow it got lodged in my brain that I must preach. I think those ignorant rural ministers who affected my youth so much must have been responsible. I smothered the thought the best I could and went on planning for a medical course. But it was useless. Conscience triumphed, and fear ruled. "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel," kept ringing in my ears. Well do I remember the day when I told the doctor my decision. We had been for a ride. The stable boy led the horse into the stable. We turned towards the house. I sorrowfully announced that I felt called to preach and would have to do it. The doctor looked at me without saying much. I do not know yet what he thought—whether it was pity or disappointment or what. But I know I felt that my fate was sealed. I went to college under compulsion of spirit. I was not doing what I wanted to do but what seemed my duty. Eighteen years later I left that profession because I had shaken off the shackles of tradition and my ministry was no longer acceptable to my orthodox parishioners. It was too late to begin a medical course then though I did think of it. Maybe it is just as well I am not a physician but at any rate I had missed doing the work I wanted to do. Would I let one of my boys repeat my experience because I did not like to guide his conscience? Not if I could prevent it. I hope they can do what they want to do. Nobody knows better than I the difficulty a boy faces now in choosing a life work. I really do not know what to recommend. But one thing I do know: they will not be kept from the work they like because I fear to give them the benefit of my experience.

I have quit praying. At least, I no longer spend any time begging God to do this or that. It took me a long time to break myself of the habit even after I lost faith in it. That was because the practice of prayer had become a part of my breathing, I might almost say. I was, as a child, desperately anxious to be "saved." It is no wonder after hearing those hell-fire sermons preached by converted drunkards who knew nothing of their direful effect on me. And so I trembled before God. I feel sure such an attitude militated against the quality of self-assurance. Anyhow, it was not until I could throw off my fear of God that I was able to gain the needed confidence in myself. I believe my boys will become real men, confident and assured. And I believe and tell them they will do so not by dependence upon God or anyone else but themselves. Therefore, I do not teach them to pray as I was taught. I teach them that to cooperate with other good people in the attempt to give all a better chance to share in this world's goods is the highest expression of what prayer should be. They will not be irreverent. Neither will they be embarrassed or ashamed because they do not say prayers. They know they are not pagans even if some of our acquaintances do think they are.

And now a word about some of the stock-in-trade evils I heard so much about: smoking, swearing, drinking and sexual promiscuity. I do not smoke. I am rather glad I do not. I think I am just as well off without it, perhaps better. But I have often told my boys if they want to smoke it is their own affair. Only I remind them that lungs are delicate and I think they are better unclouded by smoke, and I say tobacco adds a big expense to the annual budget. As to swearing, now that I am unrestrained by ministerial propriety I find myself tempted to let go sometimes, but when I hear one of my boys indulge I am yanked to attention. Then I remind him that it sounds rather crude and that we had better avoid it. Concern for good manners restrains us more than anything else. Also, I am not so afraid of a drink now as to be horrified at the suggestion of it. But I cannot say I like alcoholic liquor, and I have no intention of being led into the drink habit in any degree. What about my boys? Shall I let them do as they please? To the present I have had no reason to do otherwise. And I am not so stupid as to think I can control their practices at all parties and everywhere. But they know of some of our friends who have ruined their lives with liquor. I shall not fail to keep that fact before them. I shall do all in reason to keep my boys from the liquor habit in any degree. However, I am more confident they will control themselves in the midst of a world that is drinking for the reason that they want to do some positive beneficial work in their lives rather than because they have been taught a negative attitude to liquor. If they fall before the power of alcohol I shall think I failed to give them a positive ideal in life.

And what about the sex question? Again, I believe the dominant motive of being of value to society is the best control to hot blood. I do not try to hide from my sons the fact that a large percentage of the people are very free sexually. We talk over the fact that a young man today due to the economic situation is almost obliged to remain unmarried an unnaturally long time. And I say it is not surprising that many young people refuse to wait for formal marriage. But I believe I am not out of date in warning them that promiscuity brings complications of spirit if not otherwise which tend to break down morale. The sense of refinement and purpose in living will help my boys keep within due limits more than anything else. If they do not remain chaste until marriage I at least urge them to keep uppermost a respect for true womanhood and so be able some day to join suitable mates for life. I tell them of a young medical graduate friend of mine who though in the midst of "willing dames" remains true to the future one with whom he expects to travel the way of life. For many reasons I think this young man has chosen the more sensible direction. I tell my boys I hope I may live to see my grandchildren playing about the homes of my sons. My sons know I would hate to have them be merely blasè, sophisticated moderns, disdainful of a home of their own.

My efforts to dislodge the tyranny of greed encastled within our unfair economic system will probably continue in the realm of teaching and writing. I would not wonder if my boys will enter business of some kind. But if I can impress them that the highest type of man is guided by the consideration of all as members of a family I shall be at rest about their religion and morals. My sons and I are discarding the superstitions of religion and economics and are pressing on towards a better day.

FRANK S. HARWOOD.

The Study Table

The Logic of Love

Those who know Bill Simpson have made the acquaintance of an uncomfortable phenomenon. They may have been violently attracted to him or equally violently repelled, but they are never likely to forget him. Those who count themselves his friends have never been able to put him on like an easy-fitting coat —the experience is like the wearing of a hair-shirt. He is a bee, who, voyaging from flower to flower, cheerfully goes about his business of fertilization; but he is not averse to using his sting if he thinks a human blossom needs it. When this occurs it is not the bee who dies, but the flower may have a very sick time of it.

This book,* the climax of a series of pamphlets written through a decade, will certainly be pollen to some and poison to others. We shall not be surprised if it prove to be poison to some early friends and followers who knew Bill in his Franciscan days. They will find it difficult to relate the new Bill to the old; to find a connection between the man who made himself the common property of all and sundry, and the man who is now so selective in outlook and purpose. But in spite of his discounting of the machinations of human reason, there is an inexorable logic threading the metamorphoses of Bill Simpson. It is the logic of wide-awake love. For love which is aware must inevitably turn from the many to the few; from the quantitative to the qualitative aspects of experience.

It was logical for a loving heart to seek to apply to all the world the love he had learned in his own ideal home; to choose the ministry for a vocation; to select a broken-down church where opportunities of service were most obvious; to oppose war; to embrace socialism; to share the varied lot of the worker from the Atlantic to the Pacific; to teach his ideals in a labor college; to resign when he knew that the institution was kept by blood money; to shift from the labor movement when he realized that it needed new men rather than socialistic programs, and that the world needed changed lives rather than changed social machinery. It was the logic of love for Bill finally to adopt a wholehearted Franciscan mode of life, giving all to all, recklessly sharing all he had and was. Having met a few of the world's great souls during a trip to the Orient, it was inevitable for him to sacrifice a meeting with Gandhi—the goal of his pilgrimage—when he realized that "thy *guru* is within thee," returning home immediately to seek counsel of this Inner Light.

This realization of the ultimate authority of the Inner Monitor was the budding-time of the "new" Bill Simpson who was later to be fashioned and formed under the hands of Whitman, Blake and Nietzsche. After essaying two more years of Franciscan life it was but logical for him to appreciate the utter impossibility of raising a man from the gutter by lying there with him. Jerome Davis' biographical introduction to this book is therefore necessary to a fair evaluation of the message it contains. After such a spiritual pilgrimage, having reached his present position by such inescapable logic, it is not surprising that the author fiercely insists that the Light within is to be followed to the limit. It must be difficult for him to understand the man who fails to do what the man himself sees.

We have here an exposition of qualitative love which is concerned with "quality of life," which demands that "mankind must not merely go on, but go ever higher," which believes that "trueness is the truest love in the long run," and that love is not love at all, but a betrayal of love, becoming softness and sentimentalism, unless it has edge and direction.

The essence of this teaching is not original, but it is rarely made articulate among those of whom it might be expected. For the three-fold love of Jesus with its equal emphasis on love of God, self, and neighbor, is surely its fountainhead. Why have the qualitative imperatives of that love failed to impress the Church? The whole question resolves into: Which is the means, and which the end—Love or Life? Traditional Christianity, along with the sentimentalist, makes life subservient to love. Bill Simpson holds that love is the means to life which is the end of all living, and we believe this conviction carries the Galilean accent.

Passionate logic frequently leads to fanaticism, and for years Bill has borne this charge. But it also leads to growth. In this book are the names of the seers who have influenced the author, and we fancy that as time runs the list will be lengthened, for if ever a man *grew* it is this man, driven irresistibly by the logic of love.

CLIFFORD HAZELDINE OSBORNE.

*"Toward the Rising Sun," by William G. Simpson. Published by the Vanguard Press.

A Stirring Autobiography

This book* of Sherwood Eddy reveals a restless mind and soul, keenly alive to the changes in the restless world about him. Avid for education, and not finding any in college, he sits at the feet of men and events. The two men who have most impressed him in his pilgrimage are Dwight Moody, the American evangelist, and Mahatma Gandhi. Later Karl Marx made a deep impression. The central element in his personality is religion. Religion sent him to India, where he spent fifteen years in quiet persuasive work among the humbler groups of the population. Religion led him into the Student movement, and made him a force in the inspirations of that missionary enterprise, as John R. Mott was its statesman. Later on it was primarily the religious motive which gave the impulse for one of the chief enterprises, in which he is still engaged—the Seminars organized and directed towards acquainting the members of the traveling groups with the men and movements of foreign countries.

Although his growing heresies in religion and more particularly in the field of industrial relations aroused antagonisms and interfered with his money raising activities in connection with the Y. M. C. A., that organization stood by him, and he worked with them steadily. One of the first of these heresies was his attitude toward war. In active work at the front where he saw at first hand the cruelties, the obscenities, the awful carnage of the war, but most of all the complete denial of all that his religion stood for, he gradually came to the complete pacifist position, and renounced war and all its works.

But because he came to see that war is only an extension of capitalism, and is moreover but an extension of the ruthlessness of exploitation wherever it is

*"A Pilgrimage of Ideas," or "The Reeducation of Sherwood Eddy," Sherwood Eddy. Published by Farrar and Rinehart. $2.50.

the dominant method of industrialism, his religion led him to absorb as the next Idea in his pilgrimage, Marxian Socialism. His dynamic energies have seized upon this new opportunity for activity, and he has gone into it with all the driving power that has characterized him in other fields. Here again, one gathers that religion is the supreme motivation as it has been in his other lines of life. He has been "moved with compassion" even as Jesus, by the suffering and suffocation of the great masses of humanity due to the strangle hold of the great power of concentrated wealth. At the same time as a seeker for funds from rich men he was brought to see how few of them have been able to resist the hardening of heart which great possessions engender. Proving again after the centuries the words from the Apocrypha, "Gold hath destroyed many and hath perverted the hearts of kings."

Your reviewer gladly commends this book, especially to young men and women. Here is a mind revealed as wide open to the impressions of a world in change, a heart equally wide open to the best and deepest impulses from the wisdom and consecration of the past, and to the hunger of women and children now, hunger of body and starvation of soul of the thousands in "fields, factories and workshops." "The heart has its reasons that the reason cannot know."

JAMES A. FAIRLEY.

Bluff King Hal*

Henry VIII, father of England's navy, creator of her episcopal church, colossus of her Renaissance, takes the stage once more, at the *premiere trois coups* struck by Helen Simpson for Appleton—Gargantuan in greatness of Machiavellianism, he bestrides the earth to trumpets and thunder, while his pigmy contemporaries run about between his legs to find themselves dishonorable graves. This Renaissance Caesar, the very greatest of his line, calls lustily for reconsideration; and, if we see him through the spectacles of Machiavelli (as our dramatist desires), we shall perhaps attain a truer perspective of both his person and his period, whose epitome he is. Forward, then, with this Marlowesque melodrama of bluff King Hal!

Mirroring, for beauty, strength, and galanterie, that other spoiled prince of romance, Francis I, Henry ascended the throne at the age of nineteen—jealous spectator to France's gallant crusade in Italy, enraptured witness to his disastrous overthrow at Pavia. For that imprudent wastrel had prefaced his mad irruption by an ill-advised joust with Charles V, Central Europe's impending Titan, over the diadem of the Caesars; and, failing victory, rushed like a drunkard into war with his implacable opponent—a war whose issue would place him in the power of his Hapsburg Majesty, and, incidentally, make Henry VIII (unsuccessful contestant for that self-same crown) arbiter of his destiny. As to which side King Hal would cast his weight admitted no doubt (despite the futile pageant of Cloth of Gold); one secret session with Charles V sufficed to seal England to the scepter of Austria in the coming Armageddon between Europe's titan and France for world supremacy.

War, therefore, after a long smoldering prelude, becomes the order of the day, to the accompaniment of the headsman's axe at Tower Hill, as Henry rapidly removes his local rivals, and the romantic diapason of divorce (the first of a fateful series)—across the grim array of dominions, princedoms, and powers, flits the fantastic figure of Anne Boleyn, destined to cleave Christendom asunder; destroy England's lordliest prelate; and, her flame-shot passage over, to rise from her ashes like a Phoenix in the imperial splendors of Elizabeth and the equivocal queenliness of the Anglican church. Catastrophe, implies the Machiavellian-minded dramatist, for Henry and for England—yet the institution abides the threat. . . . At this juncture, a new note enters the direful drama: the ominous sledge-hammer blows of Cromwell, mauler of the monks, called to his side by Henry to batter down the cloistered ramparts and make way for the new structure about to rise. Although the axe devours Cromwell, yet the work goes on—and the divorces, to the total of six in all; at last an heir male for England; a Cleves disgraced; and a Culpeper, a Howard, on the scaffold.

To continue to chronicle the already familiar details of this mighty drama would be to enshrine superfluity—and, as we watch bluff King Hal sink slowly into Falstaffian girth and diseased inertia, it is time to take stock of him and his presentation. Himself, the dramatist declares (like Shakespeare), somehow escapes us. He stands, therefore, against his complement of Elizabethan pageantry and accompanying lyric choruses, towering above a portentous cast including Chancellor Wriothsley; the poets Wyat, Dunbar, and Skelton; the courtiers Norfolk, Suffolk, and Cranmer; the revolutionists Luther, Tyndale, and More; the prelates Wolsey and Beaton; the monarchs Charles and Francis of France: "the quintessence of his century and period . . . like a vast shadow thrown on the screen of history by England's self—easy to recognize, hard to know." We see him at finale in physical entity: "Of presence Majesticall"—and every inch a King. But, as Miss Simpson (whose Machiavellian asides cast more light on this difficult subject than any previous dramatist has done) declares at closing: the mind and soul of this great Tudor remain forever inscrutable; nor can we see of our colossus—even in this sound study—more than an overpowering shadow, so long that we may mistake it quite easily for that of destiny itself.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

*Henry VIII. By Helen Simpson. Published by Appleton. 1934. $1.50.

Beyond Redemption

When I can find no comfort in a book,
No inspiration from the living word,
No thrill of joy at sight or sound of bird,
No heart-stir at young love's enraptured look. . .

When I can feel no quickening of re-birth—
No gratitude for beauty or for light,
Glory of dawn, solemnity of night—
In close communion with the sky and earth. . .

And when I have no burning sense of shame
For lacking thus the power to feel at all
I am unworthy even of the name
Of man; have proven and deserved the fall:

Then let me die: For I am dead indeed
Nor can be saved by any christ nor creed.

ANNERIKA FRIES.

Correspondence

Protagonist of Civil Liberties

Editor of UNITY:

A recent critic of Father Coughlin warns him that the dire fate of Dr. Edward McGlynn, "silenced" in New York, 1887, by Archbishop Corrigan, may be his also. The noble stand for freedom of speech made while under that cruel ordeal has safeguarded the civil rights of later ones who protest the monopoly of a minority of mankind to exploit the simple-minded majority. To get a grasp of this great controversy in our national history, read (in your library) a book by Sylvester Malone, giving factual outline of the epoch. The author of "Progress and Poverty," Henry George, was running on a petition of over 30,000 names, for mayor of New York. Adversely all the churches were lined up for Abram S. Hewitt, also backed by Tammany! Only two leading churchmen supported George—Rev. R. Heber Newton, Episcopalian, and Dr. Edward McGlynn. The bulk of the denunciatory campaign literature was handed out at the doors of the Roman Catholic Church, while the local hierarchy denounced Dr. McGlynn for taking an active part in politics! Dr. McGlynn being excommunicated, many considered the matter closed and there are evidently some who never knew of his re-instatement by Mgr. Satolli, trusted intimate of Leo XIII. The ancient wisdom of the Church was symbolized dramatically when he was permitted to celebrate his first mass on Christmas Day, 1892. Left in the gloom of the picture was the archbishop who precipitated the unjust situation.

In his youthful promise, at the age of thirteen, Edward McGlynn was sent to Rome to study and was ordained there. The years he spent in mastering his vocation assured him that his later convictions on questions of "economic rent" did not conflict with the fundamentals of the church he adored; to thousands gathered at an Anti-Poverty Society meeting in New York, he said genially: "I think I know my little catechism." The morning edition of the Boston Globe, Jan. 15, 1893, quotes the remarks he made at the monster Cooper Union meeting the night before. He was suspended by the archbishop because he refused to stop teaching his belief that the rental value of land should be taxed into the public treasury. Three cables came from Rome demanding his presence; the last stated if he did not appear within forty days excommunication would follow. He said: "I could not obey the order to retract so I did not go to Rome, and I was excommunicated in July, 1887. . . . I have not retracted or condemned the doctrine in question; and yet . . . I have been relieved of ecclesiastical censure, and fully restored to my priestly ministry. . . . If in due time the holy father should express a wish to see me I should be very happy indeed to comply . . . to thank him personally for his kindly and enlightened judgment and action in my behalf."

WINIFRED B. COSSETTE.

Cambridge, Mass.

Joseph Dana Miller Convincing

Editor of UNITY:

My attention was called recently to the article on the race problem by Joseph Dana Miller in your January 7th number. It seems to me, on the whole, the ablest, the most inclusive, the most dispassionate and the most convincing article on that question, which is surrounded with so much heat, sentiment or bigotry, that I have read, and I am purchasing sixteen copies of that particular number of UNITY today. Though white myself, I am going to call the attention of two or three of the most prominent colored newspapers to this article, as I am quite sure they will wish to reprint at least excerpts from it.

EMILY E. F. SKEEL.

The Field

(*Continued from page 2*)

camps and the cause of the Reichstag fire.

The defence which Dr. Barth made was that theological faculties had a special relationship to the church, and that the totalitarian demand of Herr Hitler for complete allegiance did not extend to the theological professor's functions as a teacher of the Christian religion. Quite obviously the decision which was rendered and the arguments which preceded it reveal the fact that the earlier promise of Herr Hitler to respect the independence of the churches and the Christian religion are to be consistently disregarded.

The Civil Servants' Act of 1932 will be invoked against others as it has been in this instance against Germany's leading theologian, who has been informed by the court that he has "acted contrary to the duties of his office and is himself unworthy of the confidence essential to the profession." The judgment is a boomerang in the eyes of discerning Christians everywhere. That which is unworthy of confidence is the Nazi system.

Naturally great interest has been aroused over the fate of Professor Barth, and in many minds the question arises as to where he will now carry on his great work. A proposal has been made that he be invited to join a special division of the faculty of the University of Geneva under the patronage of the Universal Christian Council, as head of an ecumenical seminar (international and interdenominational). Interest in this proposition will doubtless grow as the realization spreads of the significance of this flatfooted declaration of the intention of the Nazis to subordinate the teaching of the Christian religion as well as the administration of the church to the arbitrary will of the State under totalitarian theory.

It is highly probable that the average reader has found nothing surprising in the announcement that Barth has been dismissed. Similarly the news in October, 1517, that a then unknown German had nailed some statements on a church door in Wittenberg probably did not seem very exciting. One may not go so far as to assert that there is a direct parallel between the two events, since only history can adequately assess the lasting significance to be attached to what happened in Cologne on Dec. 20. The Nazi regime has long been seeking a way to get rid of this annoying theologian who said absolutely "no" to the commands of the State in church affairs. He had reiterated to his great audiences of students and to his wider audiences of leaders that "Nazi theory has no abiding place in the Evangelical Church. If it pre-

vails it will be the end of the Christian Church. Better that the church be reduced to a small company and go back to the catacombs."

To the Reich Bishop, who has applied the Nazi "principle of leadership" in the church, Barth has said frankly that the whole idea was "pure and simple nonsense." To the theory of the Nazi German Christians that church leadership and eventually even church membership should rest upon the qualifications of blood, he has said: "The fellowship of the Church is not through blood and not through race. If the German Evangelical Church excludes the Jewish scriptures or regards them of secondary importance it ceases to be a Christian Church."

This latest dramatic court scene with Barth as its central figure is by no means the first to fire the imagination of the church. Barth's first work as a preacher was done in a Reformed Church in Geneva as assistant to Dr. Adolf Keller. There in the Auditoire in 1909 the future reformer preached from the same pulpit where John Calvin had spoken to a listening world and John Knox had stirred the deepest emotion of the multitude. Those who listened to Barth in 1909 little thought that he would come to occupy a place in the thought of the Christian world which is singularly reminiscent of the great reformers. If Knox challenged Mary, Queen of Scots, so has Barth challenged Hitler, and at an almost equal risk. His personal influence through the great throngs who come to his classrooms from all parts of Germany and from lands afar has in part been due to his dynamic style and the magnetic quality of his intellect. From first to last his major emphasis has been upon the absoluteness of the Divine in history and in man's individual life. Although he has often been called a fundamentalist, the term is a misnomer as applied to him. He is distinctly a liberal in his acceptance of Biblical criticism. He deals with the Bible as with other religious literature in the modern historical manner. But like his predecessors of the sixteenth century, Karl Barth finds the only source of authoritative religious knowledge in the Word of God as revealed to man and not discovered by man's own activity. He sees the coming of Christ as being in history but not of history in the sense that the evolutionist would imply. He does not take in any sense the literalistic position with respect to the Word of God, and while rejecting what he calls "psychologizing" processes which really seem to make man the measure of all things, he quite definitely regards the process of revelation as including what happens in the inner citadel of man's conscience as he is confronted by the scriptural record of God's dealing with the world.

It is no accident that the opposition to Hitler totalitarianism has formed around the vibrant, dramatic personality of this Swiss pastor and teacher. To say this is not to imply that there is complete agreement on the part of all the protesting pastors with Barthianism as a theology. Like average Christians in America, many of them will find certain of his teachings almost unintelligible, and, like others who do understand at least in part what he

TOWARD THE RISING SUN

by

WILLIAM GAYLEY SIMPSON

With A Biographical Sketch by

JEROME DAVIS

A young idealist, already known to readers of UNITY, offers in this, his first volume, an eloquent statement of his philosophy and his faith.

$1.35

Mail this coupon to your bookseller, or to:

THE VANGUARD PRESS, 100 Fifth Avenue, New York City

Gentlemen: Please send me a copy of TOWARD THE RISING SUN by William Gayley Simpson. ☐ I enclose check or money order for $1.45 (which includes 10 cents for postage and handling).

☐ Please send C. O. D.

Name .....

Address .....City .....State.....

is saying, they will raise many questions; but at some points they are in complete agreement with Barth; namely, that God is greater than any man, even a Nazi dictator; that the philosophy of racialism, state absolutism, and militarism have no place in the church; that the taking over of Nazi political ideas into the administration of the Christian Church is indefensible from the Christian point of view. No one will suppose that his spiritual leadership of the German Confessional Church—the Opposition—will end now that Barth has been forced out of his professorship at Bonn, to which he was invited after his brilliant work at Goettingen and Muenster. Though he may be an exile from Germany, he will not be a refugee. In his native land of Switzerland, to which he would be most apt to go, he will have a freedom that has been denied him in Germany, and his influence will be greatly enhanced through the professional martyrdom he has undergone.

American Christians who have not understood the significance of Barth's teaching or the reasons for his wide influence, may be interested in having a list of the major books in English which will give them that information. The first of these printed in this country was "The Word of God and the Word of Man," translated by Douglas Horton (Pilgrim). This was followed by "The Resurrection of the Dead," translated by H. J. Stenning (Fleming, Revell) and "Come Holy Spirit" (Round Table Press). The latest of the four books of Barthian authorship available in America is "The Epistle to the Romans" translated by E. C. Hoskyns (Oxford). In addition to these direct translations of Barth's own writings the following are available as revealing his mind and influence: "Karl Barth and Christian Unity," by Adolf Keller (Macmillan); "The Theology of Crisis" and "The Word and the World," by H. Emil Brunner (Scribner); "The Barthian Theologv and the Man of Today," by John McConnachie (Harper); "The Teaching of Karl Barth," by R. B. Hoyle (Scribner); "Karl Barth," by William Pauck; "Our Concern with the Theology of Crisis," by W. Lowrie (Meador); and "A Conservative Looks at Barth and Brunner," by H. Rolston (Cokesbury). The two best works in German by Barth which are not yet available are: "Theology and the Churches" and "Dogmatics."

—*The Christian Leader.*

The Modern Psychologist in Your Home

Do you desire to consult Sigmund Freud, Alfred Adler, Carl Jung, A. A. Roback, Havelock Ellis, Bertrand Russell, Erwin Wexberg, or any other eminent psychologist or psychiatrist? You need not travel to Vienna, London or Zuerich. You may receive the opinions of these great minds right in your own home by subscribing to the Modern Psychologist, the world's largest psychological journal.

The Modern Psychologist presents to you authoritative information on your most intimate problems, may they concern yourself, your family or friends.

A special advisory board will answer your direct questions.

These are some of the articles which appear or will appear in current issues of the Modern Psychologist: "UNCONSCIOUS CAUSES OF SLEEPLESSNESS," "WHAT MAKES PERSONALITY?" "PSYCHIATRIST'S MARRIAGE CONSULTATION," "WHAT IS NORMAL?," "DREAMS AND THEIR MEANING," "HOW YOUR NERVES WORK," "CURING STUTTERING BY PSYCHOANALYSIS," "WHAT ARE YOUR OBSESSIONS?," "BEING A TWIN," "IS YOUR CHILD NORMAL?" "GETTING RID OF SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS," "WHAT DOES YOUR HANDWRITING REVEAL?," "FORBIDDEN FRIENDSHIPS."

The editors of the Modern Psychologist make this special offer for a limited time.

You may receive the Modern Psychologist for a period of five months by sending $1.00 with the coupon below.

THE MODERN PSYCHOLOGIST, Dept. U
310 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y.

Gentlemen:
Enclosed please find $1.00 for which send me the magazine for five months.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

Blind

If all could see
War's horror, grief, and shame—and worse:
If all could see
That war's most hellish infamy
Fills but the plutocratic purse,
While orphans wail their threnody:
If all could see
The soul's high glory yet to be:
Then Love and Reason would rehearse
The ways to change the universe—
If all could see.

ANTON ROMATKA.

The Treaty of Versailles

Lovers of man should view with pride and awe
This novel triumph in the nations' law:
A pact of peace which, signed by Greed and Fear,
Has made more soldiers than a pact of war!

STANTON A. COBLENTZ.

STARTLING FACTS
SUPPRESSED BY OTHER PAPERS ARE BEING EXPOSED NOW IN
LA FOLLETTE'S
GREAT NATIONAL WEEKLY NEWSPAPER
Regular Price $1.50 per year
The Progressive
Get the true facts from an authority.
Special Offer 3 Months (13 Issues) **20c**
Send 20c Today for Next 13 Sensational Issues
THE PROGRESSIVE, DEPT. 44, MADISON, WISCONSIN

Unity-Forward March

A SPECIAL SUBSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN

For a period of six months, from January 1 to July 1, 1935, UNITY will accept renewals, extensions, and new subscriptions at $2.00 for one year.

UNITY is an excellent gift for friends, students, libraries, etc.

Special feature stories of MEN YOU OUGHT TO KNOW will begin in an early issue.

To Unity Publishing Company, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen: Enclosed you will find check for $2.00 for which please enter / renew / extend my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Name .....

Address .....